Transcendence vs. Transvaluation: The Divergent Existentialisms of Søren Kierkegaard and Friedrich Nietzsch

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

April 29, 2026

The mid-to-late nineteenth century marked a profound tectonic shift in Western thought, as the Enlightenment's promise of universal reason began to fracture under the weight of industrialization and institutional stagnation. At the center of this intellectual crisis stood two of history's most profound "exact opposites": Søren Kierkegaard and Friedrich Nietzsche. While both thinkers identified the same existential malaise—the dehumanizing effect of the "herd" and the hollowness of modern life—their proposed remedies represent the furthest poles of the human spirit. Kierkegaard, the "Father of Existentialism," sought to rescue the individual through a radical, inward restoration of Christian faith, arguing that truth is found only in the subjective "Leap of Faith" toward a transcendent God. Conversely, Nietzsche proclaimed the "Death of God" and sought to dismantle the very foundations of Judeo-Christian morality, urging the individual to look outward and downward into the raw energy of life to become the Übermensch. This paper explores the structural opposition between these two titans, analyzing how their divergent views on suffering, morality, and the nature of truth created the definitive blueprint for modern existential inquiry. By examining their work in tandem, we uncover a fundamental choice that continues to define the modern condition: the choice between surrendering the self to the Eternal or elevating the self to the Divine.

Keywords: Friedrich Nietzsche, Søren Kierkegaard, Existentialism, Leap of Faith, Will to Power, Subjectivity, The Individual, The Übermensch, Knight of Faith, Death of God.

A collaboration with Google Gemini-3.1-Thinking. CC4.0.

Outline

1. The Crisis of Modernity: Diagnosis of the Herd

2. Biographical Foundations: The Melancholy Dane and the Wandering Prophet

3. The Concept of the Individual: The "Single One" vs. The "Übermensch"

4. The Anatomy of Truth: Subjectivity and Perspective

5. Kierkegaard's Stages of Existence: Aesthetic, Ethical, and Religious

6. Nietzsche's Three Metamorphoses: The Camel, The Lion, and The Child

7. The Role of God: The Absolute Paradox vs. The Dead Idol

8. Ethics and Transvaluation: The Teleological Suspension vs. Slave Morality

9. The Architecture of Suffering: Christian Martyrdom vs. Amor Fati

10. Anxiety and Nihilism: Despair as a Gateway vs. Despair as a Poison

11. Historical Impact: The Theological and Secular Legacy

12. Conclusion: The Perpetual Tension of the Modern Subject

References

Art

1. The Crisis of Modernity: Diagnosis of the Herd

The Hegelian Synthesis and the Death of the Individual

To understand the crisis that both Søren Kierkegaard and Friedrich Nietzsche sought to address, one must first understand the intellectual monolith they were reacting against: Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. In the early nineteenth century, Hegelianism dominated European thought, proposing that history was a rational, unfolding process of the World Spirit. In this grand system, the individual was merely a moment in the movement of the collective or the state. Everything was being reconciled into a neat, logical package. Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, though writing decades apart and without direct knowledge of one another, both viewed this systemic rationalization as a catastrophe for the human soul. They sensed that the modern world was losing its grip on what it meant to be a singular, existing human being. While the industrial and scientific revolutions were providing humans with more comfort and objective data than ever before, the internal life of the individual was being hollowed out. The crisis of modernity, as they diagnosed it, was not a lack of knowledge, but a lack of passion and personal responsibility.

The Leveling Process: Kierkegaard's Critique of the Present Age

Kierkegaard's specific diagnosis of the nineteenth century was centered on the concept of leveling. In his work, particularly in his literary review of a novel entitled The Two Ages, he described his era as an age of reflection and chatter rather than an age of action. He argued that the modern world had become a place where people were so busy observing, discussing, and theorizing about life that they forgot to actually live it. For Kierkegaard, the primary tool of this spiritual decay was the press and the rise of the public. He viewed the public as a phantom—a monstrous abstraction that represented no one in particular but exerted a suffocating pressure on everyone. Leveling was the process by which all qualitative distinctions between individuals were flattened. In a leveled society, greatness is viewed with suspicion, and the unique, subjective experience of the individual is sacrificed at the altar of common opinion. Kierkegaard famously asserted that the crowd is untruth, because being part of a crowd exempts the individual from the terrifying task of standing alone before God or one's own conscience. This anonymity allowed people to be busy and involved while remaining spiritually dead.

The Last Man and the Herd Instinct: Nietzsche's Cultural Autopsy

Where Kierkegaard saw a failure of faith and passion, Nietzsche saw a failure of biological and cultural vitality. His diagnosis of the crisis focused on the herd instinct—the tendency of the masses to seek security, comfort, and equality at the expense of excellence and creative power. Nietzsche feared that the trajectory of modern democracy and secularism was leading toward the creation of the last man. The last man is the ultimate product of the herd: a creature who has no great dreams, seeks only meager pleasures, and lives a life of risk-free, lukewarm

happiness. To Nietzsche, the modern age was a period of exhaustion where the old religious values had lost their power to inspire, but no new values had been created to replace them. This vacuum led to nihilism, a state where nothing has meaning and everything is permitted because nothing matters. Nietzsche viewed the morality of his time as a taming process, where the wild, creative energies of the human animal were being suppressed to make the individual a safe, predictable, and useful member of the collective.

The Collective as the Enemy of Truth

The shared ground between these two disparate thinkers is their absolute disdain for the collective as a source of truth. Both believed that the modern world was conspiring to make it impossible for an individual to truly exist. For Kierkegaard, the modern Church had become a social club that made being a Christian too easy, thereby stripping the faith of its essential, radical nature. For Nietzsche, modern culture had become a factory for mediocrity that made being a human being too comfortable, thereby stripping life of its essential, tragic greatness. They both identified a paradox of modernity: as society becomes more interconnected and "enlightened," the individual becomes more isolated from their own inner reality. This diagnosis sets the stage for their divergent solutions. Kierkegaard would argue that the only way out of the herd is through a vertical ascent into the absolute relationship with the divine, while Nietzsche would argue that the only way out is a horizontal breakthrough into a new state of human being that transcends the old moralities entirely. They both agreed that the house was on fire; they simply disagreed on which window to jump out of.

2. Biographical Foundations: The Melancholy Dane and the Wandering Prophet

The Inheritance of Guilt: Søren Kierkegaard's Copenhagen

The philosophical landscape of Søren Kierkegaard cannot be divorced from the damp, cobblestone streets of Copenhagen or the heavy atmosphere of his father's house. Born into a wealthy family, Kierkegaard's early life was shadowed by a profound sense of inherited guilt. His father, Michael Kierkegaard, believed he had cursed his lineage by once cursing God as a hungry child on the Jutland heath and by later impregnated his maid before their marriage. This sense of a family curse loomed over Søren, leading him to believe that he was destined for a short life of suffering and spiritual atonement. This biographical weight manifested in his writing as a deep preoccupation with the inner self and the necessity of personal sacrifice. The most pivotal event of his life, however, was his engagement to Regine Olsen. In a move that would baffle his contemporaries and fuel his creative output for years, Kierkegaard broke off the engagement. He believed his "thorn in the flesh"—his melancholy and divine calling—made him unfit for the ethical universality of marriage. By sacrificing his earthly happiness with Regine, he sought to

become the "Single One" who could truly speak to the divine. His biography is thus a narrative of inward retreat, where the external world was discarded to amplify the signals of the soul.

The Pastoral Shadow and the Break with Basel: Friedrich Nietzsche's Journey

Friedrich Nietzsche's life followed a trajectory of radical departure rather than inward retreat. Born the son of a Lutheran pastor in Röcken, Prussia, Nietzsche was steeped in the very Christian tradition he would eventually seek to dismantle. His early brilliance led him to a professorship in classical philology at the University of Basel at the remarkably young age of twenty-four. However, the academic life proved to be a cage for his burgeoning spirit. His health, always fragile, began to fail him, leading to chronic migraines and stomach ailments that forced him to resign his post. For the next decade, Nietzsche lived as a stateless wanderer, moving between the Swiss Alps and the Mediterranean coast in search of climates that would soothe his physical agony. Unlike Kierkegaard's stable, urban existence, Nietzsche's biography is one of physical and intellectual nomadism. He was a man without a home, a country, or a church. This isolation was further compounded by his failed relationships, most notably his intellectual and romantic rejection by Lou Andreas-Salomé and his bitter break with the composer Richard Wagner, whom Nietzsche initially viewed as a cultural savior before denouncing him as a symbol of decadent German nationalism.

Physical Suffering as a Philosophical Catalyst

For both men, the body was not a neutral vessel but a primary source of their philosophical insights. Kierkegaard's melancholy was a psychological weight that he transformed into the "dread" and "trembling" necessary for faith. He lived in a state of constant intellectual friction with the Danish state church and the popular press, eventually collapsing on a street in Copenhagen and dying shortly thereafter at forty-two. His life was an exercise in enduring the tension of being a Christian in a world that had forgotten what the word meant. Nietzsche, by contrast, viewed his physical illnesses as a test of his philosophy. He famously wrote that whatever did not kill him made him stronger, using his periods of recovery to develop the concept of the "great health." His suffering was not something to be offered up to a deity, but a hurdle to be cleared through the power of the will. His final decade was marked by a catastrophic mental breakdown and a descent into silence, leaving his sister to manipulate his legacy.

Opposite Approaches to Personal Legacy

The way these two men curated their public personas also reveals their fundamental opposition. Kierkegaard used a dizzying array of pseudonyms—Victor Eremita, Johannes de Silentio, Anti-Climacus—to hide his true self and force the reader into a direct confrontation with the text. He wanted to be a "spy in the service of God," working undercover to undermine

the complacency of the public. Nietzsche, conversely, became increasingly autobiographical and grandiose in his later works, particularly in Ecce Homo, where he titled chapters "Why I Am So Wise" and "Why I Am a Destiny." He wanted his life to be a spectacle of self-overcoming, a lighthouse for the future Overmen. While Kierkegaard sought to disappear so that God could be seen, Nietzsche sought to expand his presence until he occupied the vacuum left by the absent God. Their lives were the laboratories for their ideas, proving that for the true existentialist, there is no distinction between the biography and the bibliography.

3. The Concept of the Individual: The "Single One" vs. The "Übermensch"

The Inward Sovereignty of the Single One

For Søren Kierkegaard, the highest category a human being can achieve is that of the Single One. This concept was so central to his identity that he once requested it be the only inscription on his gravestone. To become the Single One is not a matter of social isolation or mere eccentricity; it is a rigorous spiritual achievement. Kierkegaard argued that the crowd is the ultimate source of untruth because it relieves the individual of the burden of being a self. In a group, responsibilities are diffused, and the terrifying weight of eternal choice is muffled by the consensus of the majority. The Single One is the individual who has stripped away these social crutches to stand in an absolute relationship with the absolute. This process is inherently inward. It does not require a change in one's external circumstances—one can be a clerk, a father, or a king—but it requires a radical transformation of the internal disposition. The Single One recognizes that truth is not something to be found in a textbook or a political platform, but is something that must be lived with subjective passion. This individuality is defined by its relationship to a power higher than the self, making the Kierkegaardian individual a vessel for divine will.

The Outward Vitality of the Übermensch

Friedrich Nietzsche’s concept of the Übermensch, or Overman, stands as the aggressive, secular counterpart to Kierkegaard’s Single One. While Kierkegaard’s individual finds meaning through a vertical submission to God, Nietzsche’s individual finds meaning through a horizontal overcoming of the human condition. The Übermensch is the person who has looked into the abyss of nihilism—the realization that there is no objective meaning or divine plan—and has decided to become the source of meaning themselves. This is an individual of supreme health and creative power. Unlike the Single One, who is characterized by humility and trembling before the infinite, the Übermensch is characterized by pride and the affirmation of the finite. The Übermensch does not ask what the truth is; they decide what the truth will be for them. They are the "poets of their own lives," creating a personal aesthetic and moral code that stands

in direct opposition to the "herd morality" of the masses. For Nietzsche, the individual is not a finished product but a bridge to be crossed, a transition toward a higher state of being that values strength, beauty, and the "will to power" over the virtues of pity and self-denial.

Synthesis of Opposition: Vertical vs. Horizontal Transcendence

The structural opposition between these two models of individuality reveals the fundamental split in existentialist thought. Both thinkers agree that the mass man is a failure of existence, a "non-self" that hides in the safety of the collective. However, their paths of escape lead in opposite directions. Kierkegaard's individual transcends the world by going deeper into the self until they hit the bedrock of the divine. This is a vertical transcendence: the individual is defined by their "otherness" from the world because they belong to God. Nietzsche's individual transcends the world by expanding the self until it consumes the world's meaning. This is a horizontal transcendence: the individual is defined by their "otherness" from the world because they have evolved beyond its traditional constraints.

One seeks to be a perfect servant; the other seeks to be a perfect master. One views the self as a gift to be returned to the creator; the other views the self as a raw material to be sculpted into a monument. Despite these differences, both share a common enemy: the comfortable, unthinking "we." Whether through the "Leap of Faith" or the "Will to Power," both Kierkegaard and Nietzsche demand that the individual take full, agonizing responsibility for their own existence, rejecting any system—be it religious, political, or scientific—that claims to provide a universal answer for everyone. In their view, the moment you agree with the majority, you have ceased to exist as a true individual.

4. The Anatomy of Truth: Subjectivity and Perspective

Kierkegaard and the Subjectivity of Faith

For Søren Kierkegaard, the most significant error of modern philosophy was the attempt to treat existential and religious truths as if they were mathematical or historical facts. In his seminal work, Concluding Unscientific Postscript to Philosophical Fragments, he famously asserted that subjectivity is truth and truth is subjectivity. This was not a claim that all opinions are equally valid or that the physical world does not exist; rather, it was a distinction between the what and the how of belief. Objective truth, such as scientific data or historical dates, is concerned with the what—the external object of inquiry. While useful for navigating the material world, Kierkegaard argued that such knowledge is fundamentally indifferent to the existing individual. A person can know all the historical facts about the life of Christ and still not be a Christian in any meaningful sense.

Subjective truth, conversely, is defined by the relationship of the individual to the idea. It is concerned with the how—the passion, the inwardness, and the level of commitment with which an individual holds a belief. Kierkegaard illustrates this with the famous example of two men praying. One man prays in a house of worship to the true conception of God but does so with a false, hypocritical spirit; the other man prays to an idol with the entire passion of his soul. Kierkegaard suggests that the latter is closer to the truth, despite his objective error, because truth in an existential sense is a matter of being rather than knowing. Because the finite human mind cannot bridge the gap to the infinite through logic or reason, the only way to grasp the highest truth is through a passionate, subjective leap. For Kierkegaard, truth is an objective uncertainty held fast in an appropriation-process of the most passionate inwardness.

Nietzsche and the Doctrine of Perspectivism

Friedrich Nietzsche took the rejection of objective truth in a more radical, naturalistic direction through his doctrine of perspectivism. While Kierkegaard sought to anchor subjectivity in the individual's relationship to a transcendent God, Nietzsche argued that there is no anchor at all. He famously claimed that there are no facts, only interpretations. In Nietzsche's view, the idea of an objective, disinterested knowledge—a God's-eye view of reality—is a linguistic and psychological fiction. All knowledge is produced from a specific perspective, driven by the needs, biological drives, and the will to power of the knower. What we call truth is simply a collection of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms that have been solidified through social usage until they seem like fixed realities.

Nietzsche viewed the human drive for truth not as a noble quest for enlightenment, but as a survival mechanism. We categorize the world into stable truths because a world of constant flux is terrifying and impossible to navigate. Therefore, the will to truth is often a masked form of the will to power—a desire to simplify and master the complexity of existence. Unlike the Enlightenment thinkers who believed that stripping away biases would reveal a universal truth, Nietzsche believed that the more perspectives we can bring to bear on a subject, the more complete our understanding becomes. He did not want to eliminate subjectivity; he wanted to multiply it. For Nietzsche, the mark of a higher spirit is the ability to maintain multiple, even conflicting, perspectives without succumbing to the need for a single, comforting certainty.

The End of the Universal Subject

Both Kierkegaard and Nietzsche represent a violent break from the Cartesian and Hegelian traditions that sought a universal, rational subject. By placing the individual at the center of the truth-making process, they effectively ended the era of the universal system. Kierkegaard's truth is a solitary encounter with the divine that cannot be communicated through the language of the universal or the ethical; it is a secret between the individual and God. Nietzsche's truth is a

creative act of the will that serves the enhancement of life, making it a weapon for the strong and a shield for the weak.

The opposition between them lies in the destination of this subjective turn. For Kierkegaard, the subjectivity of the individual finds its fulfillment in a paradox that lies beyond human reason—the God-man. The subjectivity is a vessel that must be filled by a higher authority. For Nietzsche, the subjectivity is the source of all authority. There is no higher power to fill the vessel; the individual must instead overflow with their own creative energy. Kierkegaard uses subjectivity to find a way back to a radicalized faith, while Nietzsche uses it to pave the way for a world where humans must become their own gods. In both cases, the anatomy of truth is no longer a matter of discovery, but a matter of how one chooses to stand in relation to the abyss of existence.

5. Kierkegaard's Stages of Existence: Aesthetic, Ethical, and Religious

The Aesthetic Stage: The Pursuit of Immediacy

The aesthetic stage represents the most basic and common mode of human existence. For Kierkegaard, the aesthete is an individual who lives for the moment, prioritizing the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of boredom above all else. This lifestyle is not necessarily defined by crude hedonism; it can include the refined pursuit of art, music, intellectual stimulation, and complex romantic intrigues. The defining characteristic of the aesthetic life is its immediacy. The aesthete reacts to life as it happens, seeking to extract the maximum amount of novelty and variety from every situation. In his work Either/Or, Kierkegaard explores the rotation method, a psychological strategy where the individual constantly shifts their perspective or social environment to prevent life from becoming stagnant. However, the aesthetic life is fundamentally fragmented. Because the aesthete refuses to make a definitive choice that would bind their future self—such as a long-term commitment or a career—they lack a cohesive identity. They are essentially a collection of moods and reactions rather than a unified person. Over time, the pursuit of pleasure inevitably leads to a profound sense of emptiness, as the individual realizes that no amount of external novelty can provide lasting internal meaning. This realization manifests as despair, which Kierkegaard identifies as the necessary catalyst for moving toward the next stage of being.

The Ethical Stage: The Commitment to the Universal

The transition to the ethical stage occurs when an individual makes a conscious, decisive choice to take responsibility for their life and align themselves with universal moral laws. While the aesthete lives for the exception and the fleeting moment, the ethicist lives for the rule and the enduring commitment. The primary exemplar of the ethical life for Kierkegaard is marriage.

Unlike a romantic conquest, which relies on the fluctuating feelings and passions of the aesthetic stage, marriage is a social and moral institution that requires duty, consistency, and a shared future. By entering the ethical stage, the individual gains a sense of selfhood and continuity. They are no longer a slave to their immediate impulses but a participant in the shared moral life of the community. The ethicist finds meaning in being a responsible citizen, a loyal friend, and a productive member of society. They believe that human reason and social structures are sufficient to guide an individual toward a good and meaningful life. However, the ethical stage also contains its own inherent limitations. It relies on the assumption that the universal laws of society are the highest authority. For Kierkegaard, the ethical stage eventually collapses when the individual encounters a situation where human morality is insufficient, or when they confront their own deep-seated inability to perfectly fulfill the moral law.

The Religious Stage: The Leap into the Absurd

The third and highest stage of existence is the religious stage, which Kierkegaard further categorizes into Religiousness A and Religiousness B. Religiousness A is a general form of religiousness characterized by a commitment to the eternal through suffering, guilt, and self-renunciation. It remains within the realm of human reason and immanence. Religiousness B, or specifically Christian religiousness, is defined by the encounter with the absolute paradox: the claim that the eternal God entered finite time as a human being in the person of Jesus Christ. This stage requires a leap of faith because the paradox cannot be understood through logic or rational deduction; it is, from a human standpoint, absurd. The religious individual enters into a private, absolute relationship with God that may transcend or even contradict the universal laws of the ethical stage. This is famously illustrated in Fear and Trembling through the story of Abraham and Isaac. Abraham's willingness to sacrifice his son is what Kierkegaard calls a teleological suspension of the ethical—a moment where the individual obeys a divine command that violates the universal ethical prohibition against murder. For Kierkegaard, this is the pinnacle of existence because it represents the total surrender of the self to a power that is higher than any human system, resulting in a radical and authentic individual identity.

The Bridge of Despair: The Mechanism of Transition

The movement between these three stages is not an automatic or inevitable progression like the biological aging process. Instead, it requires a radical act of the will—a choice that Kierkegaard describes as a leap. One does not simply slide from the aesthetic to the ethical or from the ethical to the religious; rather, the transition is fueled by the experience of despair. Despair acts as a spiritual alarm system that alerts the individual to the insufficiency of their current mode of existence. When an individual fully inhabits one stage and experiences its ultimate failure to satisfy the deep needs of the soul, they are faced with a crisis of existence. This crisis can either lead to a deeper, more destructive form of despair or to a leap into the

next, higher stage. The leap is a moment of extreme risk and uncertainty, as the individual must abandon the security of their current worldview for something they cannot yet fully comprehend. In this way, Kierkegaard's stages of existence provide a map of the internal struggle for meaning, demonstrating that the path to true selfhood is a journey of increasing isolation from the mass and increasing proximity to the divine.

6. Nietzsche's Three Metamorphoses: The Camel, The Lion, and The Child

The Spiritual Evolution Toward the Overman

In his philosophical masterpiece, Thus Spoke Zarathustra, Friedrich Nietzsche outlines a psychological and spiritual evolution through the allegory of the three metamorphoses. This framework describes how the human spirit transforms itself to overcome the weight of tradition and eventually become a creator of new values. Unlike Kierkegaard's stages, which move toward a transcendent divine, Nietzsche's metamorphoses are entirely immanent, representing the internal development of the individual's will to power. Each stage is necessary, and the transition from one to the next requires a radical shift in the spirit's relationship to authority and reality.

The Camel: The Spirit of Burden and Obedience

The first metamorphosis is that of the camel. The spirit in this stage is characterized by its hunger for burden and its reverence for tradition. Like a camel kneeling to be loaded, the spirit seeks out the most difficult tasks to test its strength. It asks: What is heavy? In this phase, the individual embraces the "thou shalt" of society, religion, and established morality. The camel-spirit is humble, disciplined, and deeply respectful of the wisdom of the past. For Nietzsche, this stage is essential because it builds the spiritual muscle and endurance required for the transformations to come. One cannot become a creator without first having been a servant to the highest values of one's culture. However, the camel eventually realizes that the desert it inhabits is lonely and that the burdens it carries are not its own, but those imposed by a dying tradition.

The Lion: The Spirit of Rebellion and the Great No

When the spirit enters the loneliest desert, it undergoes the second metamorphosis: it becomes a lion. The lion's goal is to capture its freedom and become master in its own desert. It seeks a final struggle with the "great dragon" named "Thou Shalt." Every scale on this dragon glitters with the values of thousands of years, and the dragon claims that all value has already been created. To this, the lion says "I will." The lion represents the power of negation and the destruction of old idols. It does not yet have the power to create new values, but it creates the

freedom necessary for new creation. This is the stage of the revolutionary, the iconoclast, and the nihilist who recognizes that the old gods are dead and that the old moralities are cages. The lion must slay the dragon of tradition to clear the ground for a new way of being.

The Child: The Spirit of Innocence and the Sacred Yes

The final metamorphosis is the child. Nietzsche asks why the lion must still become a child. He answers that the child is innocence and forgetting, a new beginning, a game, a self-propelling wheel, a first motion, a sacred Yes. While the lion was a spirit of "no," the child is the spirit of "yes." The child has moved beyond the reactive struggle against tradition and exists in a state of pure, creative play. Having forgotten the burdens of the camel and the anger of the lion, the child is able to create their own world and their own values. This is the ultimate realization of the Übermensch—one who views life not as a moral duty or a struggle for freedom, but as an aesthetic phenomenon to be enjoyed and shaped. The child represents the return to a primordial state of curiosity and joy, where the individual is finally at home in the world without the need for external justification.

The Contrast of Directionality

The structural opposition between Nietzsche's metamorphoses and Kierkegaard's stages is profound. Kierkegaard's progression moves from the self-centeredness of the aesthete to the universal duty of the ethicist, and finally to the absolute submission of the religious individual. It is a journey of increasing humility and external reliance. Nietzsche's progression moves in the opposite direction. It begins with the submission of the camel, moves through the rebellion of the lion, and culminates in the self-sufficient creativity of the child. For Kierkegaard, the highest state is to be a servant of God; for Nietzsche, the highest state is to be a god of one's own creation. One seeks the restoration of a lost connection to the eternal, while the other seeks the birth of a new humanity that has finally outgrown the need for the eternal. Both models, however, agree that the vast majority of people remain stuck in the preliminary stages—the "herd" for Nietzsche and the "crowd" for Kierkegaard—never finding the courage to undergo the final, terrifying transformation.

7. The Role of God: The Absolute Paradox vs. The Dead Idol

The Infinite Qualitative Distinction: Kierkegaard's Wholly Other

For Søren Kierkegaard, the relationship between God and humanity is defined by what he called the infinite qualitative distinction. He argued that God is not simply a more powerful or more intelligent version of a human being; God is of an entirely different order of existence. Any attempt to reach God through human reason, logic, or systematic theology is doomed to fail

because it tries to bridge an unbridgeable chasm with finite tools. Kierkegaard was a fierce critic of the natural theology of his day, which sought to prove God's existence through the design of the universe or the internal consistency of ideas. To Kierkegaard, a God who could be proven would not be God, but merely a philosophical concept. For the individual to truly relate to God, they must first acknowledge their own nothingness and the total "otherness" of the divine. This creates a state of permanent tension and trembling. God is not a comfort to be possessed but a power that demands the total surrender of the individual's rational faculties.

The God-Man as the Absolute Paradox

The center of Kierkegaard's religious philosophy is the Absolute Paradox: the incarnation of Jesus Christ. The claim that the eternal, infinite, and immutable God entered into time as a finite, suffering, and dying human being is, for Kierkegaard, the ultimate offense to the human intellect. Reason recoils at the idea that the eternal could become historical. However, it is precisely this absurdity that makes faith possible. If Christianity were a rational philosophy, it would require only intellectual assent; because it is a paradox, it requires a leap. Kierkegaard distinguishes between the disciple at second hand—who believes because of tradition or social pressure—and the contemporary disciple, who confronts the paradox in all its scandalous difficulty. To be a Christian is to exist in the "simultaneity" of this paradox, holding onto the promise of the God-man with the passion of the infinite. In this view, God is the "stumbling block" that forces the individual out of the herd and into a solitary, terrifyingly personal relationship with the divine.

The Announcement of Deicide: Nietzsche's Dead Idol

While Kierkegaard sought to restore the radical "otherness" of God, Friedrich Nietzsche famously announced that God is dead. In The Gay Science, Nietzsche uses the character of a madman to proclaim this event to an indifferent marketplace. It is crucial to understand that Nietzsche was not making a metaphysical claim about the non-existence of a deity; rather, he was making a cultural and historical observation. The "death of God" meant that the Christian God had ceased to be a living, effective force in Western civilization. The Enlightenment, the rise of science, and the increasing focus on material progress had rendered the idea of a transcendent moral authority unbelievable. For Nietzsche, God was an idol—a human projection of our own fears, hopes, and "will to power"—that had served its purpose as a stabilizing force but had now become a weight that hindered human evolution. By killing God, humanity had "unchained the earth from its sun," leading to a state of cosmic homelessness and the threat of total nihilism.

The Shadows of God and the Need for a New Sun

Nietzsche warned that while the "event" of God's death had occurred, its consequences would take centuries to fully manifest. He spoke of the "shadows of God"—the lingering remnants of Christian morality, logic, and the belief in objective truth—that continued to haunt the European mind. He believed that most people in his time were "atheists" who still clung to Christian values like pity, equality, and humility without realizing those values were rooted in the very theology they had discarded. Nietzsche's project was to complete the deicide by exorcising these shadows. If there is no God to provide a universal "Thou Shalt," then humanity must face the terrifying freedom of creating its own values. Where Kierkegaard saw the absence of God as the ultimate despair that should drive one toward a leap of faith, Nietzsche saw it as a "great noon"—a moment of supreme liberation where the individual could finally step out from the shade of the divine and become a creator.

The Convergence of the Abyss

Despite their opposing conclusions, both thinkers utilized the "absence" of a rational, easy-to-understand God to isolate the individual. For Kierkegaard, the silence of God and the absurdity of the paradox strip away the individual's social identity, leaving them alone before the Absolute. For Nietzsche, the death of the idol strips away the individual's moral safety net, leaving them alone before the Abyss. Both reject the "lukewarm" God of the institutional church—the God of Sunday sermons and social respectability. Kierkegaard's God is too high to be reached by anything but the heart; Nietzsche's God is too low to be anything but a corpse. The choice they present is between a radical re-centering of life around a transcendent mystery or a radical re-centering of life around the creative self. In both cases, the comfortable middle ground of the "herd" is destroyed, and the individual is forced to choose between the eternal and the earthly.

8. Ethics and Transvaluation: The Teleological Suspension vs. Slave Morality

The Suspension of the Universal: Kierkegaard's Radical Exception

For Søren Kierkegaard, ethics are synonymous with the universal. In the ethical stage of existence, an individual's duty is to act in a way that can be justified to all other members of society through reason and shared moral laws. However, in his profound meditation on the story of Abraham and Isaac in Fear and Trembling, Kierkegaard introduces the terrifying concept of the teleological suspension of the ethical. This occurs when an individual encounters a direct command from God that contradicts the universal moral law. In Abraham's case, the ethical law dictates that a father must love and protect his son, yet God commands him to sacrifice Isaac. By obeying God, Abraham suspends his ethical obligation for the sake of a higher telos, or

purpose. This is not a transition to a "better" or "more evolved" morality, but a terrifying leap into a realm where the individual can no longer be understood by society. Abraham cannot explain himself to Sarah or his servants because his actions are, from a rational and ethical standpoint, indistinguishable from murder. Kierkegaard argues that this suspension is what distinguishes the Knight of Faith from the tragic hero. While the tragic hero sacrifices himself for a higher ethical cause that the community can understand, the Knight of Faith stands in a private, absolute relationship with the Absolute that leaves him utterly alone.

The Genealogy of Values: Nietzsche's Revolt Against Pity

While Kierkegaard sought to find a space above the ethical for the divine command, Friedrich Nietzsche sought to dismantle the very foundations of Western ethics through what he called the transvaluation of all values. In On the Genealogy of Morals, Nietzsche proposes that modern morality is not an objective truth but a historical product of ressentiment. He distinguishes between master morality—which originates in the strong, healthy individual who affirms life, strength, and beauty as "good"—and slave morality. Slave morality, according to Nietzsche, was created by the weak and the oppressed as a defensive reaction against the strong. It redefines the traits of the powerful as "evil" and elevates the traits of the weak—pity, humility, patience, and equality—as "good." Nietzsche viewed this Christian-Platonic morality as a form of spiritual poison that had tamed the human spirit and stifled the development of the Übermensch. His goal was to move beyond good and evil by exposing the power dynamics behind these labels. For Nietzsche, the ethical is not a universal truth to be obeyed or suspended, but a cage to be broken. The transvaluation of values is the process by which the creative individual rejects the "thou shalt" of the herd and establishes a new hierarchy of values based on the enhancement of life and the will to power.

Duty to the Divine vs. Loyalty to the Earth

The opposition between these two thinkers on the subject of ethics reveals a fundamental disagreement about the source of value. Kierkegaard's individual is willing to break the moral law because of a duty to a transcendent, "wholly other" God. This individual is defined by obedience and a recognition of a higher authority that exists outside of human history and biology. In contrast, Nietzsche's individual breaks the moral law out of a loyalty to the earth and the biological potential of the species. The Nietzschean hero rejects the idea of any authority higher than the creative will. For Kierkegaard, the danger of ethics is that it can become an idol that replaces God; for Nietzsche, the danger of ethics is that it is an idol that replaces life.

Kierkegaard's Knight of Faith is an exception because of his proximity to the infinite, whereas Nietzsche's Overman is an exception because of his mastery over the finite. Both thinkers, however, place a massive burden on the individual to act without the comfort of social

approval. Whether one is following a divine voice into the silence of the mountain or following a creative drive into the chaos of self-creation, both Kierkegaard and Nietzsche insist that the truly great individual is the one who has the courage to be an "exception" to the rules of the herd. They both demand a form of "meta-ethics" where the individual is the ultimate arbiter of their own integrity, but they lead that individual to two completely different masters: the Creator of the world or the Creator of the self.

9. The Architecture of Suffering: Christian Martyrdom vs. Amor Fati

The Crucible of Pain as a Philosophical Necessity

While many philosophical systems seek to minimize or explain away human suffering, Søren Kierkegaard and Friedrich Nietzsche both placed it at the absolute center of their thought. They shared the conviction that a life without suffering is a life without depth, but they diverged fundamentally on the ultimate purpose of that pain. For both, suffering was not an accident of biology or a flaw in the universe; it was the essential forge in which the individual is created. However, the architecture they built around this suffering led them to opposite conclusions: one toward the humble endurance of the cross and the other toward the joyous embrace of a repeating, chaotic destiny.

Kierkegaard and the Imitation of Christ

For Kierkegaard, suffering is the inevitable consequence of a finite being attempting to relate to an infinite God. He often spoke of his own "thorn in the flesh," a metaphor for the psychological and spiritual melancholy that haunted his life and which he viewed as a divine gift. In the Kierkegaardian framework, suffering serves two primary purposes. First, it acts as a corrective to the aesthetic life. Pain shatters the illusions of the immediate world, forcing the individual to realize that no earthly pleasure can provide a permanent home for the soul. Second, suffering is the hallmark of the true Christian.

Kierkegaard was deeply critical of the "soft" Christianity of the Danish State Church, which he felt had turned the religion into a comfortable social ritual. He argued that to be a Christian is to follow Christ, and Christ’s life was defined by rejection, mockery, and crucifixion. Therefore, the degree to which an individual suffers for their faith is the degree to which they are actually in the truth. This is not a masochistic pursuit of pain for its own sake, but a recognition that the "offense" of the gospel will naturally bring the individual into conflict with the world. Suffering is the "neighbor" of faith; it is the evidence that the individual has successfully separated themselves from the crowd and is standing in a direct, agonizing relationship with the Absolute. In this sense, the individual "dies to the world" so that they may live in God.

Nietzsche and the Doctrine of Amor Fati

Nietzsche viewed suffering not as a sign of divine favor or a path to another world, but as the primary fuel for the enhancement of life here on earth. He famously declared that he did not want to be a "saint" but rather a "satyr," someone who says "Yes" to life in its most terrible and questionable aspects. The centerpiece of Nietzsche's response to suffering is the concept of Amor Fati—the love of one's fate. This is the radical demand that one should want nothing to be different, not forward, not backward, not in all eternity. One must not merely endure the "necessary" but love it.

For Nietzsche, the "great health" is not the absence of sickness, but the ability to integrate illness and pain into a higher state of power. He believed that the Christian attempt to find a "meaning" or "reward" for suffering in the afterlife was a form of cowardice—a way of slandering the earth. Instead, Nietzsche proposed the thought experiment of the Eternal Recurrence: if a demon told you that you had to live your entire life over and over again, including every pain and every joy, for all eternity, would you collapse in despair or would you view it as a divine gift? The Übermensch is the one who can say "Yes" to the eternal return of their own suffering. In this view, pain is the resistance that allows the "will to power" to exert itself and grow. Suffering is not something to be redeemed by a God; it is something to be justified by the individual's own creative strength.

The Martyr vs. The Hero

The opposition between Kierkegaard and Nietzsche on suffering can be summarized as the difference between the martyr and the hero. Kierkegaard's suffering is an act of submission. The individual suffers because they are "wrong" before God and because the world is "wrong" before the truth. The martyr accepts pain as a form of communication with the divine. Nietzsche's suffering is an act of affirmation. The individual suffers because they are "too much" for the world, and they accept pain as the necessary price of greatness. The hero transforms pain into an aesthetic monument.

Kierkegaard looked at the cross and saw the necessity of self-denial and the hope of an eternal resolution. Nietzsche looked at the cross and saw a symbol of "the poor in spirit" who had turned their resentment against life into a religion. Where Kierkegaard sought to find meaning *through* suffering in a transcendent reality, Nietzsche sought to find meaning *in* suffering as an immanent reality. Despite these differences, both men stood as a unified front against the modern desire for a "painless" life. They both understood that the moment humanity succeeds in eliminating suffering, it will have succeeded in eliminating the very thing that makes us human. For both the Dane and the German, the avoidance of pain is the ultimate form of spiritual suicide.

10. Anxiety and Nihilism: Despair as a Gateway vs. Despair as a Poison

The Dizziness of Freedom: Kierkegaard's Concept of Anxiety

For Søren Kierkegaard, the defining psychological state of the human being is anxiety, or dread. In his work The Concept of Anxiety, he describes this state not as a clinical disorder, but as a fundamental ontological condition. Anxiety is the dizziness of freedom. He uses the metaphor of a person standing on the edge of a cliff: the person feels a sense of dread not just because they might fall, but because they realize they have the freedom to throw themselves off. This realization of pure possibility—the "can-ness" of the self—is the source of human anxiety. It is the moment when the individual realizes they are not just a programmed animal or a cog in a social machine, but a being that must choose its own path in the face of an infinite future.

Kierkegaard argues that anxiety is the necessary precursor to faith. Without the experience of this dizziness, an individual remains stuck in the unreflective immediacy of the aesthetic stage. Anxiety pulls the individual out of the comfortable sleep of the crowd and forces them to confront their own singularity. In The Sickness Unto Death, Kierkegaard expands this into a study of despair. He defines despair as a misalignment of the self—a failure to relate to oneself and to the power that established the self. While despair is a miserable state, Kierkegaard views it as a mark of human nobility. Only a being with an eternal dimension is capable of feeling despair. Thus, despair is a gateway; it is the "sickness" that, by making the earthly world uninhabitable, forces the soul to seek its grounding in the eternal.

The Uncanniest Guest: Nietzsche's Anatomy of Nihilism

Friedrich Nietzsche identified a similar void at the heart of modern existence, but he termed it nihilism. For Nietzsche, nihilism is the realization that the highest values have devalued themselves. It is the "uncanniest of guests" that stands at the door of Western civilization, a result of the death of God and the subsequent collapse of a unified moral and metaphysical order. Unlike Kierkegaard's anxiety, which is an internal realization of freedom, Nietzsche's nihilism is a historical and cultural event. It is the terrifying silence that follows the discovery that there is no objective meaning, no inherent purpose to the universe, and no "true world" behind the veil of appearances.

Nietzsche distinguished between two forms of this condition. Passive nihilism is the "poison" of the modern age—a weary resignation where the individual, realizing that the old values are gone, gives up on life and retreats into the meager comforts of the "last man." This is the nihilism of exhaustion. Active nihilism, however, is a sign of increased power of the spirit. The active nihilist uses the realization of meaninglessness as a hammer to destroy old idols and clear the way for new creations. For Nietzsche, the goal is to pass through nihilism and come out the

other side. If the world has no inherent meaning, the individual is finally free to bestow their own meaning upon it.

Despair as Spiritual Surgery vs. Biological Decay

The opposition between these two views lies in the "telos" or end-goal of the suffering. For Kierkegaard, despair is a form of spiritual surgery. It is a painful but necessary process that strips away the false layers of the self until only the core remains, which must then be handed over to God. The "cure" for despair is not the elimination of anxiety, but the transformation of anxiety into faith. The individual finds peace by resting transparently in the power that created them. Despair is the mechanism that ensures the individual never feels too at home in the finite world.

Nietzsche, conversely, views the Kierkegaardian type of despair as a symptom of biological and psychological decadence—a "slander against life." To Nietzsche, looking for an eternal solution to a worldly problem is the ultimate form of nihilism. He believes that despair should be met not with a "leap" into the arms of a deity, but with a "sacred Yes" to the earth. The cure for nihilism is not faith, but the transvaluation of values and the affirmation of the Eternal Recurrence. Where Kierkegaard sees despair as a sign that we belong to another world, Nietzsche sees it as a challenge to prove that we are strong enough to belong to this one.

In both cases, these thinkers treat the most negative of human emotions as the most valuable. They both reject the modern pursuit of "happiness" as a shallow and dehumanizing goal. Whether it is the "dizziness of freedom" or the "uncanny guest" of nihilism, they agree that the human being must first be broken by the realization of their own isolation before they can become something truly great. The divide remains: does the road through the dark night of the soul lead to a cathedral or to a mountaintop of one's own making?

11. Historical Impact: The Theological and Secular Legacy

Kierkegaard and the Birth of Neo-Orthodoxy

The immediate reception of Søren Kierkegaard’s work was largely confined to Denmark, where he was viewed as a brilliant but eccentric polemicist. However, his true historical impact exploded in the early twentieth century, particularly following the devastation of World War I. The optimism of liberal theology and Enlightenment progress had collapsed in the trenches, creating a vacuum that Kierkegaard’s "philosophy of the limit" was perfectly suited to fill. The Swiss theologian Karl Barth utilized Kierkegaard’s infinite qualitative distinction to launch the Neo-Orthodox movement, which sought to rescue Christianity from cultural assimilation by re-emphasizing the radical transcendence of God. Barth’s "Crisis Theology" was essentially a

Kierkegaardian rejection of human-centric religion. Beyond Barth, Kierkegaard's influence extended into the existential theology of Paul Tillich and Rudolf Bultmann, providing a language for faith that could survive in a secularized, fragmented world. By centering the religious experience on the individual's subjective encounter with the paradox, Kierkegaard provided the intellectual tools for a modernized, resilient Christianity that did not rely on historical proof or social consensus.

Nietzsche and the Postmodern Turn

Friedrich Nietzsche's impact on the twentieth century was even more explosive and far-reaching, though also more controversial. In the decades following his death, his ideas were famously misappropriated by his sister, Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche, to support German nationalism and anti-Semitism—a distortion that would take scholars decades to untangle. Once reclaimed, Nietzsche became the primary architect of the postmodern condition. His critique of objective truth and his doctrine of perspectivism laid the groundwork for post-structuralist thinkers like Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida. Foucault's analysis of the relationship between knowledge and power is a direct evolution of Nietzsche's will to power, while Derrida's deconstruction of Western metaphysics carries on the Nietzschean project of "philosophizing with a hammer." In the realm of psychology, both Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung acknowledged Nietzsche as a precursor who had mapped the geography of the unconscious and the drives of the human psyche long before clinical psychology existed. Nietzsche's secular legacy is found in every movement that seeks to dismantle grand narratives and question the "naturalness" of moral and social structures.

The Existentialist Synthesis in the Twentieth Century

The most visible point of convergence for the legacies of both men was the rise of mid-century existentialism, led by figures such as Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, and Martin Heidegger. While these thinkers were largely secular, they operated within a framework established by the tension between Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. Sartre's famous dictum that existence precedes essence is a direct synthesis of the individual responsibility championed by both men. Camus's philosophy of the absurd is a secularized version of Kierkegaard's absolute paradox, replacing the leap of faith with a defiant, Nietzschean "Yes" to a meaningless universe. Heidegger's exploration of "Dasein" and the "They" (das Man) is a philosophical formalization of the critique of the herd and the crowd. Together, the legacies of the Dane and the German created the modern subject: an individual who is "condemned to be free," standing between the silence of a lost God and the responsibility of a self-created future. Their historical impact is not merely found in books, but in the very way modern individuals understand their own identity as a project to be realized rather than a fact to be accepted.

12. Conclusion: The Perpetual Tension of the Modern Subject

The Symmetry of the Abyss

In the final analysis, Søren Kierkegaard and Friedrich Nietzsche represent the two most extreme and consistent responses to the collapse of traditional European certainty. While they are often viewed as historical antagonists—the defender of faith versus the herald of the Antichrist—their structural symmetry is undeniable. Both thinkers functioned as cultural physicians who diagnosed the nineteenth century with a terminal case of mediocrity, conformity, and spiritual exhaustion. They both identified the collective, whether termed the public or the herd, as the primary enemy of human excellence and authentic existence. Most importantly, they both refused the easy comfort of the Hegelian system, which sought to reconcile all contradictions into a rational whole. Instead, they left the modern individual standing at the edge of an abyss, stripped of the delusions of objective certainty. The difference between them lies entirely in the direction they suggested the individual should look while standing on that ledge: Kierkegaard toward the heights of a transcendent paradox, and Nietzsche toward the depths of an earthly self-overcoming.

The Choice of the Modern Era

The tension between these two figures is not merely a matter of historical or philosophical interest; it constitutes the very architecture of the modern condition. To be a modern subject is to be caught in the perpetual oscillation between the desire for transcendence and the drive for autonomy. Kierkegaard offers the individual a way to ground their identity in something eternal, but at the cost of sacrificing their rational independence and worldly comfort. His path is one of inwardness, humility, and the terrifying responsibility of a private relationship with the divine. Nietzsche offers the individual the glory of becoming their own creator, but at the cost of a profound cosmic isolation and the burden of inventing meaning in a silent universe. His path is one of outward vitality, pride, and the aesthetic justification of existence. This choice—between the Leap of Faith and the Will to Power—remains the fundamental fork in the road for anyone seeking to live an authentic life in the wake of the death of traditional authority.

The Enduring Relevance of the Individual

As we move deeper into the twenty-first century, the warnings of the Dane and the German seem more prescient than ever. In an age of digital hyper-connectivity, the "leveling" process Kierkegaard feared has been amplified by social media, where the "public" is no longer a phantom but a constant, algorithmic presence. Simultaneously, the "last man" Nietzsche predicted—the consumer who seeks only comfort and trivial amusement—has become the global standard for success. In this environment, the call to become an individual is both more difficult and more necessary. Whether through a radical re-engagement with the religious

dimension or a courageous commitment to self-creation, the legacies of Kierkegaard and Nietzsche demand that we reject the safety of the herd. They remind us that to be human is to be an exception, a transition, and a task. By holding these two "exact opposites" in a state of constant tension, we find the space to define ourselves not as objects of history, but as the subjects of our own existence.

References

Primary Sources: Søren Kierkegaard

Kierkegaard, S. (1983). Fear and Trembling / Repetition. Edited and Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton University Press.

Kierkegaard, S. (1985). Philosophical Fragments / Johannes Climacus. Edited and Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton University Press.

Kierkegaard, S. (1980). The Sickness Unto Death: A Christian Psychological Exposition for Upbuilding and Awakening. Edited and Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton University Press.

Kierkegaard, S. (1992). Concluding Unscientific Postscript to Philosophical Fragments. Edited and Translated by Howard V. Hong and Edna H. Hong. Princeton University Press.

Kierkegaard, S. (2001). A Literary Review: Two Ages. Translated by Alastair Hannay. Penguin Classics.

Primary Sources: Friedrich Nietzsche

Nietzsche, F. (2006). Thus Spoke Zarathustra. Edited by Adrian Del Caro and Robert Pippin. Translated by Adrian Del Caro. Cambridge University Press.

Nietzsche, F. (1974). The Gay Science: With a Prelude in Rhymes and an Appendix of Songs. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. Vintage Books.

Nietzsche, F. (1989). On the Genealogy of Morals / Ecce Homo. Translated by Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale. Vintage Books.

Nietzsche, F. (1990). Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future. Translated by R. J. Hollingdale. Penguin Classics.

Nietzsche, F. (1968). The Will to Power. Translated by Walter Kaufmann and R. J. Hollingdale. Vintage Books.

Secondary Literature

Hubben, W. (1952). Four Prophets of Our Destiny: Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky, Nietzsche, Kafka. Macmillan.

Lowrie, W. (1938). Kierkegaard. Oxford University Press.

Kaufmann, W. (1974). Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist. Princeton University Press.

Westphal, M. (1991). Kierkegaard's Critique of Reason and Society. Pennsylvania State University Press.

Nehamas, A. (1985). Nietzsche: Life as Literature. Harvard University Press.

Barrett, W. (1958). Irrational Man: A Study in Existential Philosophy. Doubleday.

The author has published over 5,300 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.